APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,624	03/17/2004	Zachary C. Williams	7784-000982	4801

27572   7590   07/31/2008
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
CRAIG, DWIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 April 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _25-44_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _25-43_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _44_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 25-44 have been presented for reconsideration based on Applicants' amended

claim language and arguments.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicants' arguments presented in the 4/18/2008 responses have been fully considered;

The Examiner's response is as follows:

2.1   As regards Applicants' response to the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 25-32 as set

forth in the Office Action mailed on 1/18/2008, on page 8 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants'

argued;

> *Claim 25 is directed to an "...apparatus comprising a processor and memory configured*
>
> *to..." etc. The remaining recitations of claim 25 make it clear that it is the apparatus itself that is*
>
> *being claimed. Claim 25 does not recite a method of using the apparatus.*

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' argument, while the Examiner

acknowledges that Claim 25 expressly teaches a processor and a memory, the subsequent

claimed limitations are clearly method steps, for example, the next *elements* of the claimed

apparatus are claimed as;

> *represent each process as a set of performable operations;*
>
> *associate each operation with a cost of performing the operation;*
>
> *receive a user selection of an operation performable in a first of the processes;*

These are method steps, and therefore the claim contains both elements of an apparatus

and method steps, section 2173.05(p) clearly states that a Product and a Process in the same

claim is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112. By Applicants' own admission, the current claims

contain elements of an apparatus and, as shown by the Examiner, the claim clearly contains

method steps as well, therefore the Examiner fails to see how the current arguments traverses the

rejections as set forth and will therefore be maintained.

2.2   As regards Applicants' response to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of claims 25-32 as set

forth in the Office Action mailed on 1/18/2008, on page(s) 8 & 9 of the 4/18/2008 responses

Applicants' argued;

> *Claims 25-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to neither a*
>
> *"process" nor a "machine." This rejection is respectfully traversed. As previously discussed,*
>
> *claim 25 is directed to an apparatus comprising a processor and memory. Claim 25 does not*
>
> *overlap two different statutory classes, An apparatus that generates a signal is a machine; In re*
>
> *Nuijten, 84 USPQ2d 1495, 1502 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Further, there is nothing inherently wrong*
>
> *with defining some part of an invention in functional terms. Functional language does not, in*
>
> *and of itself, render a claim improper. MPEP § 2173.05(g); In re Swinehart, 439 F. 2d 210, 169*
>
> *USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971), Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under*
>
> *35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.*

For the reasons set forth in response to the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 25-32 it

is unclear exactly which statutory category Applicants' are claiming as regards claims 25-32 and

there fore the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims have to be directed to

only one statutory category namely, an article of manufacture, a process, an apparatus or a

composition of matter, in Applicants' case it is unclear if the current claimed *apparatus* is infact

an apparatus or if Applicants' are attempting to claim a *process*.

2.3   As regards Applicants' response to the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of claims 25-44 as set

forth in the Office Action mailed on 1/18/2008, on page(s) 9-14 of the 4/18/2008 responses

Applicants' argued;

> *For example, Gadh describes "precedence relations" in the context of geometric components (col. 2, lines 38-62). Applicant submits that "precedence relations" would have very different meanings in a fault model such as Felke's, where the effects of failure are related to failures. It would not be obvious to incorporate geometrical model-dependent aspects of Gadh into the model of Felke.*

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' argument, the Examiner notes that in the

Gadh et al. reference is clearly disclosed that Col. 3 lines 6-35 mores specifically starting on Col.

3 line 25 clearly teaches, "(most particularly, <u>failure to detect</u> interference components during

linear global assembly/disassembly motions)" discloses that in fact the teachings of *Gadh et al.*

teach that the methods disclosed therein can be used in *fault models* because they are used to

detect *failures*, therefore the teachings of *Felke et al.* and *Gadh et al.* are compatible and actually

teach into each other.

On page 10 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

> *It seems evident that in Gadh there is no teaching or suggestion of "duplicate" operations. Therefore Gadh cannot teach or suggest eliminating performance of duplicate operations.*

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' argument, the claimed limitation of

determining *duplicate* operations is being interpreted to mean that an *"optimized"* method of

disassembly is being determined with an emphasis on certain systems or subsystems, clearly

Gadh et al. is teaching such methodologies, note Col. 6 lines 32-54 more specifically, "In the

foregoing processes, user-defined constraints may be incorporated to tailor disassembly

sequences to a users liking. As an example, a user might want to restrain certain components to

removal in a certain number of user-defined directions,"… and further starting on line 49, "the

target components can be grouped and analyzed as a single element within the assembly…"

grouping elements as a single element removes duplicate operations because instead of taking

elements out piecemeal *Gadh et al.* teaches that they are taken out as a group, which removes

duplication.

On page 10 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

Simultaneously removing two components from a given structure, however, does not mean that one of the component removals duplicates the other. Further, simultaneous removal of two components in one step does not mean that one of the removal operations is eliminated. Two assembly/disassembly sequences described by Gadh for the same structure can have the same number of component removal operations but different numbers of removal steps. It also would be inaccurate to refer to two steps (which could be reduced to one step through simultaneous performance) as duplicates of each other, since they each would involve removal of a different component.

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' argument, *Gadh et al.* teaches the

optimized method of disassembly based on a user selection, see response above, and therefore

substantially teaches the claim method of not repeating steps.

On page 11 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

Further, even assuming (for the sake of argument only) that Gadh teaches or suggests eliminating duplicate operations, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation to modify the apparatus of Felke by incorporating a method of eliminating "un-needed duplicate steps in a maintenance or repair procedure" as asserted in the Office Action.

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' argument, as set forth in the Office

Action dated 1/18/2008 clearly discloses, At the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have eliminated un-needed duplicate steps in a

maintenance or repair procedure. The suggestion for doing so Would have been to reduce costs

associated with performing a repair, see Col. 23 lines 28-41 of Gadh et al., which teaches, that

the disclosed invention will be used in the assembly and disassembly when a product is used,

which teaches right to what Applicants' are attempting to get patent protection for, therefore,

there is a clear *suggestion* for the combination of *Gadh et al.* and *Felke et al.* as set forth in the

previous office action.

On page 12 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

Any introduction of individual repair cost adjustments into the ranking algorithm of Felke would change its principle of minimizing an average cost for a repair. Additionally, it is stated in the Office Action that an artisan of ordinary skill, when performing a maintenance action on a mechanical system, would recognize an opportunity to perform another repair if the situation accommodates that repair. Applicant respectfully submits that the construction, repair and/or maintenance of aerospace systems are highly complex processes. The design, construction and maintenance of an aerospace system represent the pooling of knowledge of many people. An aerospace system such as the Space Shuttle can be serviced by groups of people in several different locations. An artisan of ordinary skill working on an aerospace system is not likely to be in a position to spontaneously recognize an opportunity to perform a repair.

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' arguments, *cost adjustments* would not

break the teachings of *Felke et al.* Figure 3 item 313 clearly teaches that costs are taken into

account, further, when viewed in combination with the teachings of *Gadh et al.* the teachings of

Felke et al. would be enhanced because the work could be done in a more efficient manner by

allowing a user to group different assemblies together when assembling and disassembling the

different systems, see Col. 6 lines 32-54 of *Gadh et al.* more specifically, "In the foregoing

processes, user-defined constraints may be incorporated to tailor disassembly sequences to a

users liking. As an example, a user might want to restrain certain components to removal in a

certain number of user-defined directions", the ability to be able to model *user-defined*

constraints would enhance the model of *Felke et al.* and would provide further suggestions and

motivation to use the teachings in combination.

As regards Applicants' arguments regarding the complexity of aerospace systems, clearly

Gadh et al. is teaching a complex aerospace system, see Figures 12 & 13, however, neither *Gadh*

et al. nor *Felke et al.* expressly teach a plurality of Aerospace work and/or test stations.

Therefore, in view of the newly amended limitations, the previously applied prior art rejections

of claims 31 and 44 are being withdrawn.

On page 13 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

> *Claim 32 is amended to recite a processor and memory configured "...to display a list of operations performable after the selected operation without incurring cost beyond any cost of the operations performable after the selected operation." Neither Felke nor Gadh, alone or together, teach or suggest the recitations of claim 32 as amended. Further, it is admitted in the Office Action that "Felke does not expressly disclose, to represent each process as a set of sequential operations." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 as amended should be allowed.*

> The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' argument, *Gadh et al.* teaches a list of

operations, see Figures 13 and 15.

On pages 13 & 14 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

> *With reference to independent claims 33 and 38, it is admitted in the Office Action (with reference to claim 32) that "Felke does not expressly disclose, to represent each process as a set of sequential operations." Further, as previously discussed with reference to claim 25, neither Felke nor Gadh teach or suggest determining duplicate operations. Accordingly, neither Felke, Gadh, nor Thogard, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "...receiving from a user a selection of one of the operations of a first of the processes; determining whether the selected operation is performable as part of a second of the processes; and based on the determining, notifying the user as to a feasibility of combining performances of the first and second processes" as recited in claim 33. As to claim 38, neither Felke, Gadh, nor Thogard, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "receiving from a user a selection of one of the operations of a first of the processes; determining whether the first process is a first sub-process of a second process, and whether the selected operation is duplicated in a second sub- process of the second process; and based on the determining, notifying the user as to a feasibility of combining performances of the sub-processes" as recited in claim 38. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 33 and 38, and claims 34-37 and 39-44 respectively dependent on claims 33 and 38, should be allowed.*

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' arguments as regards claims 33 and 38

for the reasons already stated see above.

On page 14 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' argued;

As to dependent claims 31 and 44, the claims are amended to recite that "the plurality of
processes are performed at a plurality of aerospace work and/or test station locations between
which at least part of the aerospace system is moved ..." Amended claim 31 further recites "...the
processor and memory configured to identify one or more of the station locations for performing
the selected operation." Amended claim 44 further recites "...identifying one or more of the
station locations for performing the selected operation." Neither Felke nor Gadh, alone or in
combination, teach or suggest the recitations of claims 31 and 44 as amended.

The Examiner has found this argument to be persuasive and withdraws the earlier 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 31 and 44.

On page 14 of the 4/18/2008 responses Applicants' further argued;

Additionally, claims 27 (dependent on claim 25) and claim 40 (dependent on claim 38)
are amended. For example, amended claim 40 recites "...determining whether an operation is a
mandatory operation performable downstream of the selected operation or a permissive
operation that need not be performed; and based on the determining, notifying the user as to
costs associated with the mandatory operation." Felke discloses possible tests (Fig. 3, item 313
and descriptive text) and possible repairs or operations, which could change after testing (col.
20, lines 28-67). Neither Felke nor Gadh teach or suggest distinguishing between mandatory and
permissive operations or notifying a user as to costs associated with a mandatory operation.
Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27 and 40 should be allowed.

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants' arguments, *Felke* teaches costs as

argued above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

3.1   Claims 25-32 are rejected because it is unclear if the Applicants' are attempting to claim

the apparatus, i.e. the processor and memory or the method of using the apparatus.

MPEP section 2173.05 section II clearly states:

"A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the

apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *> IPXL Holdings v.

Amazon.com, Inc., 430 F.2d 1377, 1384, 77 USPQ2d 1140, 1145 (Fed. Cir. 2005);< Ex parte

Lyell, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) *>(< claim directed to an automatic

transmission workstand and the method * of using it * held ** ambiguous and properly rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph>)<. Such claims *>may< also be rejected under 35

 U.S.C. 101 based on the theory that the claim is directed to neither a "process" nor a "machine,"

but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C.

101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. Id.

at 1551."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim is directed to neither a

"process" nor a "machine," but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of

invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of

invention in the alternative only, see MPEP section 2173.05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
      or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 25-30 and 32-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent 6,748,304 to Felke et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,725,184 to Gadh et al. and in

further view of Water Pump Replacement Info,

http://www.abnormal.com/~thogard/vw/h2opump.html hereafter referred to as *thogard*.

5.1   Regarding independent claims 25, 33 and 38 and using independent claim 25 as an

example, *Felke et al.* teaches, *an apparatus for facilitating the management of costs associated*

with performing a plurality of processes to manufacture, <u>*service*</u> *and/or maintain an aerospace*

system, incorporating a plurality of physical components, the apparatus comprising a processor

and memory configured to: represent each process as a set of performable operations; associate

each operation with a cost of performing the operation; receive a user selection of an operation

performable in the first of the processes; (Figures 1 & 2 and the descriptive text, regarding the

limitation to service or maintain an aerospace systems see Col. 1 lines 10-31 more specifically,

"Examples of such complex systems include factories, major buildings, ocean-going vessels,

power generation plants, and <u>aircraft</u> to name a few... " see also Col. 1 lines 50-67, regarding

associating a cost of performing an operation see Col. 6 lines 44-60 and Col. 10 lines 28-67 also

service is functionally the same as repair which is disclosed Col. 12 lines 43-21)

However, *Felke et al.* does not expressly disclose, *determine whether the selected*

operation is a duplicate of another operation performable in the first process and/or

performable in a second of the processes; and based on the determination, notify the user as to a

possible reduction of costs by elimination of a duplicate performance of the selected operation.

Gadh et al. suggests *determine whether the selected operation is a duplicate of another*

operation performable in the first process and/or performable in a second of the processes; and

based on the determination, notify the user as to a possible reduction of costs by elimination of a

duplicate performance of the selected operation, (that while performing complex assembly of

aerospace systems that the sequence in which the assembly is performed must be analyzed in

order to determine the correct disassembly ordering and having to take into account assembly

conditions and precedence conditions see Col. 2 lines 38-62 and Figure 20 and Col. 23 lines 7-41

and Col. 22 lines 39-63 which clearly suggest that disassembly of components in an aerospace

system, in this case an airplane engine, that the order or the *precedence conditions* need to be

accounted for, in other words when taking apart a complex mechanical assembly there is a cost

associated with performing the assembly in the most efficient and cost effective manner. It is

noted that notification to the user is clearly disclosed in both references, in *Gadh et al.* teaches

Figure 12 which is clearly a GUI).

Both *Felke et al.* and *Gadh et al.* are from the same problem solving area of repair,

assembly and maintenance of aerospace systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art to have eliminated un-needed duplicate steps in a maintenance or repair procedure.

The suggestion for doing so would have been to reduce costs associated with performing

a repair, see Col. 23 lines 28-41 of *Gadh et al.* further and in regards to the knowledge of an

artisan of ordinary skill, clearly the knowledge that when performing a maintenance action on a

mechanical system that, if during the course of performing the repair and artisan would

recognize an opportunity to perform another repair if the situation accommodates that repair, for

example, when having to replace a timing belt on a car an artisan of ordinary skill would know to

also replace the other "belts" on the front of the engine as well as replace the "water pump" see

the pages of *thogard.*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine *Gadh et al.* with *Felke et al.* to obtain

the invention as specified in claims 25-44.

5.2   Regarding dependent claims 26, 34, 37 and 39 and using claim 26 as an example, *Felke*

et al. does not expressly disclose, *identifying one or more operations dependent on performance*

of the selected operation; and notifying the user as to costs associated with the identified

dependent operations, however *Gadh et al.* teaches, (precedence conditions see Col. 2 lines 38-

62).

5.3   Regarding claims 27 and 40 and using claim 27 as an example, *Felke et al.* teaches,

determine whether an operation is a mandatory operation performable downstream of the

selected operation or a permissive operation that need not be performed and based on the

determining notify the user as to the costs associated with the mandatory operation (Figure 3

more specifically item # 313 and the descriptive text, see also Col. 10 lines 28-67 and Col. 11

lines 1-58).

5.4   Regarding claims 28, 29, 35 and 42 and using claim 28 as an example, *Felke et al.*

teaches, *modifying one(two) or more representation of one(two) or more processes based in user*

input (Figure 1 more specifically items 119 and the descriptive text embodied in *Felke et al.*

regarding user input and multiple processes, see also Figure 2, note the list of multiple processes,

items 205, 207, 209, 211 and 213, see the descriptive text regarding the embodiment).

5.5   Regarding claims 30 and 43, *Felke et al.* teaches an *aerospace vehicle* (Figure 1 items

123 and 101).

5.6   Regarding claim 32 *Felke et al.* does not expressly disclose, *to represent each process as*

a set of sequential operations and to display a list of operations performable after the selected

operation without incurring cost beyond any, cost of the operations performable after the selected operation, however *Gadh et al.* teaches, Figures 1-10 and the descriptive text, note in Figure 8 the phrase "disassembly sequence" and further and in regards to the teaching of a display of a list of operations see Figures 13 & 15.

5.7   Regarding claims 36 and 41 and using claim 36 as an example, *Felke et al.* does not expressly disclose, *modifying a representation of a set of operations that includes the selection operation, the modifying performed based on input from the user* however, *Gadh et al.* teaches Figures 12-23 and the descriptive text.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 31 and 44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: While *Felke et al.* teaches *an apparatus for facilitating the management of costs associated with performing a plurality of processes to manufacture, service and/or maintain an aerospace system* and *Gadh et al.* teaches *determining whether the selected operation is a duplicate of another operation performable in the first process and/or performable in a second of the processes; and based on the determination, notify the user as to a possible reduction of costs by elimination of a duplicate performance of the selected operation,* **none of these references taken alone or in combination with the prior art of record disclose,** wherein the plurality of processes are performed at a plurality of aerospace work and/or test station locations between

which at least part of the aerospace system is moved, the method further comprising identifying

one or more of the station locations for performing the selected operation, specifically including:

(claim 31) "...wherein the plurality of processes are performed at a plurality of

aerospace work and/or test station locations between which at least part of the aerospace system

is moved, the processor and memory are configured to identify one or more of the station

locations for performing the selected operation...",

(claim 44) "...wherein the plurality of processes are performed at a plurality of aerospace

work and/or test station locations between which at least part of the aerospace system is moved,

the method further comprising identifying one or more of the station locations for performing the

selected operation...", **in combination with the remaining elements and limitations of the**

claims from which these claims depend.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DWIN M. CRAIG whose telephone number is (571)272-3710. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul L. Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dwin McTaggart Craig
AU 2123

/Paul L Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2123